

Maurer School of Law: Indiana University
Digital Repository @ Maurer Law

Indiana Law Journal

Volume 15 | Issue 3

Article 13

2-1940

Notes on Integrated Bar

Follow this and additional works at: <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj>



Part of the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1940) "Notes on Integrated Bar," *Indiana Law Journal*: Vol. 15: Iss. 3, Article 13.
Available at: <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol15/iss3/13>

This Special Feature is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Indiana Law Journal* by an authorized administrator of Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. For more information, please contact wattn@indiana.edu.



JEROME HALL LAW LIBRARY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Maurer School of Law
Bloomington

NOTES ON INTEGRATED BAR

BY THE ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE OF INTEGRATED BAR

Indiana Association again goes "integrated."

The unanimous action taken at the recent mid-winter meeting of the Indiana State Bar Association in support of the proposed consolidation of the bar of Indiana was the sixth time since 1932 the Association has gone on record as favoring bar integration. In thus again aligning itself with this movement, the organization continues in the society of fourteen other jurisdictions which stand committed to the project, and of twenty-four others which already enjoy it. The only states not interested are Illinois, and a small group in the extreme northeast section of the country. Today fully nine-tenths of the area of the United States is occupied by states having integration, or whose state associations unqualifiedly favor it. A handful of jurisdictions, of which Indiana is one, still insist on keeping their faces turned toward the past.

Recent recruits to Integrated Bar ranks.

In the past two years four states have adopted the Integrated Bar principle: Arkansas, Virginia, Texas and Wyoming. In each of these, as in Indiana, there was opposition from uninstructed quarters, but the intelligence of the bar prevailed. The old, thread-bare arguments of "regimentation," "coercion," "Fascism," "Communism," "dictatorship," and "Glorified C. I. O.," were furbished up and again dragged forth to do duty, but were laughed off the stage and a sensible, workable plan of consolidation adopted, the trend being to organize under Supreme Court rules, either with or without an enabling statute.

Hats off to the Supreme Court of Oklahoma!

Oklahoma for years had an integrated bar. For local and special reasons it fell under criticism and in 1939 the act creating it was repealed, the repeal taking effect on July 28, 1939. On July 29, 1939, the Supreme Court made an order creating an executive council of the bar to function provisionally and on October 10, 1939, entered its final order, occupying six columns of newspaper space, integrating the bar of the state. In this order the Court found that it did not need to await legislative authority to act, but had inherent power to admit to the bar and to control and regulate the practice of law throughout the state, because all attorneys are officers of the Court and are answerable to it, whether the Legislature so declares or not. The courage and independence of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma are inspiring, and will serve to stimulate courts of other states which have been hesitating.

Antagonists of Integration as Potential Protagonists

Texas knows how to deal with "conscientious objectors" to bar unification. Instead of ridiculing or berating them, the bar of that state recognizes their value as possible friends, and cultivates them, as indicated by a recent article in the Texas Bar Journal. The objector has a real value. He is usually dynamic, outspoken, independent, liberty-loving, and intensely profession-conscious. These admirable traits, if brought under his control and directed toward a fair and impartial examination of the advantages of bar integration as compared with its alleged disadvantages, may become assets on the side of consolidation. The lawyer who hurls Philippics at integration may become its best friend, when he realizes that his abilities will find their most effective modes of expression through the many outlets which a state unified bar affords.

LAW INSTITUTE ON LAW OF EVIDENCE

On Friday, April 5, starting at 1:30 P. M. and continuing through Saturday, April 6, to 4:30 P. M., the Indiana University School of Law and the Indiana State Bar Association will jointly conduct an institute on "Recent Developments in the Law of Evidence." Professor Edmund M. Morgan of the Harvard School of Law will deliver the lectures.

All members of the Bar of Indiana are invited to attend this institute.

DEATHS

Edmund K. Adams, age 87, Shelbyville, died December 25, 1939.

Frank S. Terry, age 84, Rochester, died December 7, 1939.

Edwin Corr, age 79, Bloomington, former Indiana University Trustee and Attorney for the Indiana University Board of Trustees, died January 24, 1940.

John C. Taylor, age 66, Danville, died December 31, 1939.

Harry F. Kennerk, age 66, Fort Wayne, died January 19, 1940.

Walter L. Neible, age 66, Edinburg, died December 5, 1939.

John W. Craig, age 59, Greensburg, Judge of the Decatur Circuit Court, died January 9, 1940.

Frederick R. Bonifield, age 59, Indianapolis, died November 29, 1939.

Daniel H. Ortmeier, age 59, Evansville, died November 29, 1939.

Clarence H. Wills, age 53, Kokomo, died December 7, 1939.

Kleber W. Hadley, age 50, Indianapolis, died December 17, 1939.

Oscar Haney, age 49, Hammond, died December 30, 1939.

Thomas F. Moran, age 39, Lafayette, died January 3, 1940.